



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/712,654	11/14/2000	Ramesh Gupta	ECB-0010	4644

27810 7590 07/24/2003

EXXONMOBIL RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING COMPANY
P.O. BOX 900
1545 ROUTE 22 EAST
ANNANDALE, NJ 08801-0900

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

RIDLEY, BASIA ANNA

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1764

DATE MAILED: 07/24/2003

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application N .	Applicant(s)
	09/712,654	GUPTA ET AL.
	Examiner Basia Ridley <i>[Signature]</i>	Art Unit 1764

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 03 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 9-12 and 14-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. Other: _____.

Jerry D. Johnson
JERRY D. JOHNSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: arguments presented therein are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In the instant case, Gupta clearly teaches that bypass apparatus without "moving or destructible component" (e.g. rupture disc) is an improvement over an apparatus which contains said moving or destructible component (C1/L45-60).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that all bypass tubes are of equal length) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Further, the examiner would like to point out that the rejected claim(s) do not exclude bypass tubes of various lengths, as the claimed transitional term "comprising" permits the inclusion of other steps, elements, or materials, including both, those disclosed but not claimed by applicant and those neither disclosed nor contemplated by applicant. See *In re Baxter*, 656 F.2d 679, 686, 210 USPQ 795, 802 (CCPA 1981).

Additionally the applicant argues that the person of ordinary skill in the art would not expect the system of Gupta to be applicable with advantage to the system of Beal, because in Beal the bypass tubes terminate inside the bed and in Gupta the bypass tubes pass completely through the catalyst bed. This is not found persuasive, as Gupta, for example in Fig. 3, clearly shows that bypass tubes placed within one portion of fixed catalyst bed (22a) are used to bypass flow into a lower layer of said catalyst bed (22b) and that bypass tubes placed within another portion of said fixed catalyst bed (22b) are used to bypass flow into a bottom layer of said catalyst bed (21). This is clearly applicable to the system of Beal in which, as shown in Fig. 7, a bypass apparatus is also used to bypass a portion of catalyst bed.